UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,776	02/25/2002	Victor A. Bennett	BENNETT 6-5	4410

47396 7590 10/07/2005

HITT GAINES, PC
AGERE SYSTEMS INC.
PO BOX 832570
RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER	
LI, AIMEE J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2183	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/082,776	BENNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aimee J. Li	2183	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 have been considered. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-16, and 18-20 have been amended as per Applicant's request.

Papers Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: RCE as received on 21 July 2005 and Amendment as received on 21 July 2005.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 5, 12, and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: Each claim recites the limitation "...a beginning stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop when said thread reaches and an end stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop...". Please correct this to --a beginning stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop when said thread reaches [[and]] an end stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop--. Added language is underlined and deleted language have strikethroughs and/or double brackets. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parady, U.S. Patent Number 5,933,627 (herein referred to as Parady) in view of Microware™'s

"OS-9: Real-Time Operating System – The Complete Software Solution for Your Embedded Application" ©1999 (herein referred to as OS-9).

6. Referring to claim 1, Parady has taught a context switching system for a multi-thread execution pipeline loop having a pipeline latency, comprising:

a. A context switch requesting subsystem configured to:

i. Detect a device request from thread executing within said multi-thread execution pipeline loop for access to a device having a fulfillment latency exceeding said pipeline latency (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3), and

ii. Generate a context Switch request for said thread (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3); and

b. A context controller subsystem configured to receive said context switch request (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3).

7. Parady has not explicitly taught

a. A miss fulfillment first-in-first-out buffer (FIFO); and

b. Based thereon, store said thread in said miss fulfillment FIFO to prevent said thread from executing until said device request is fulfilled.

8. However, Parady has taught using a round robin scheduling method (Parady column 4, lines 9-11). OS-9 has taught round robin scheduling (OS-9 page 5) with a

a. A miss fulfillment first-in-first-out buffer (FIFO) (OS-9 page 5); and

b. Based thereon, store said thread in said miss fulfillment FIFO to prevent said thread from executing until said device request is fulfilled (OS-9 page 5).

9. In regards to OS-9, the event queue stores processes that are blocked, waiting for some event to complete, like an I/O access. This is similar to a miss fulfillment FIFO, which, by its name and the language in the claim, stores processes that wait for some other event, like an I/O access, to complete. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that a round-robin scheduling method is a fairly simple method that guarantees that all processes will be executed while ensuring that priority between processes is maintained, thereby preventing starvation of a process while giving consideration to more important processes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the round robin method of OS-9 in the device to ensure all processes are executed while maintaining priority and simplicity.

10. Referring to claim 8, Parady has taught for use with a multi-thread execution pipeline loop having a pipeline latency, a method of operating a context switching system, comprising:

a. Detecting a device request from a thread executing within said multi-thread execution pipeline loop for access to a device having a fulfillment latency exceeding said pipeline latency (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3);

b. Generating a context switch request for said thread when said thread issues said device request (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines

18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3); and

c. Receiving said context switch request (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3).

11. Parady has not explicitly taught storing said thread based thereon in a miss fulfillment first-in-first-out buffer (FIFO) until said device request is fulfilled. However, Parady has taught using a round robin scheduling method (Parady column 4, lines 9-11). OS-9 has taught round robin scheduling (OS-9 page 5) storing said thread based thereon in a miss fulfillment first-in-first-out buffer (FIFO) until said device request is fulfilled (OS-9 page 5). In regards to OS-9, the event queue stores processes that are blocked, waiting for some event to complete, like an I/O access. This is similar to a miss fulfillment FIFO, which, by its name and the language in the claim, stores processes that wait for some other event, like an I/O access, to complete. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that a round-robin scheduling method is a fairly simple method that guarantees that all processes will be executed while ensuring that priority between processes is maintained, thereby preventing starvation of a process while giving consideration to more important processes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the round robin method of OS-9 in the device to ensure all processes are executed while maintaining priority and simplicity.

12. Referring to claims 2 and 9, Parady in view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem is further configured to allow a new thread to enter said multi-thread

execution pipeline loop after storing said thread in said misfulfillment FIFO (OS-9 page 5). In regards to OS-9, after waiting for the event, e.g. I/O access, to complete, the process is moved to the active queue, which holds processes active and ready to be executed (OS-9 page 5). From the active queue, the highest priority process runs each tick (OS-9 page 5).

13. Referring to claims 3 and 10, Parady in view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem is further configured to allow other threads within said multi-thread execution pipeline loop to continue to execute while said thread is waiting for said device request to be fulfilled (Parady column 2, lines 28-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, line 42-62; and Figure 3).

14. Referring to claims 4 and 11, Parady in view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem is further configured to:

a. Store said thread in said miss fulfillment FIFO upon reaching an end position of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop (OS-9 page 5),

b. Sequence said thread through said miss fulfillment FIFO (OS-9 page 5), and

c. Reinsert said thread into said multi-thread execution pipeline loop at a beginning position (OS-9 page 5).

15. Referring to claims 5 and 12, Parady in view of OS-9 has taught wherein said thread is looped back to a beginning stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop when said thread reaches an end stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop and said thread has not finished processing (OS-9 page 5).

16. Referring to claims 6 and 13, Parady in view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem is further configured to sequence said thread through said miss fulfillment

FIFO at a rate having a period substantially equivalent to said pipeline latency (OS-9 page 5). In regards to OS-9, the wait queue only holds processes that are blocked and waiting for some event to complete, e.g. waiting for an I/O access to complete. This I/O access latency substantially equivalent to the pipeline latency.

17. Referring to claims 7 and 14, Parady in view of OS-9 has taught wherein said device request is a request to access external memory due to a cache miss status (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3).

2. Claims 15-17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parady, U.S. Patent Number 5,933,627 (herein referred to as Parady) in view of Wilford et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,509,006 (herein referred to as Wilford) and in further view of Microware™'s "OS-9: Real-Time Operating System – The Complete Software Solution for Your Embedded Application" ©1999 (herein referred to as OS-9).

3. Referring to claim 15, Parady has taught a fast pattern processor that receives and processes protocol data units (PDUs), comprising:

a. A dynamic random access memory (DRAM) that contains instructions (Parady column 5, lines 19-22; Figure 5; and Figure 6). In regards to Parady, DRAM in a specific type of RAM and Parady shows that RAM is used in his system. Please see Rosenberg's Computers, Information Processing & Telecommunications Second Edition for more information of RAM and DRAM.

b. A memory cache that caches certain of said instructions from said DRAM (Parady column 5, lines 19-22; Figure 5; and Figure 6); and

c. An engine that employs said DRAM and said memory cache to obtain ones of said instructions (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3), including:

i. A multi-thread execution pipeline loop having a pipeline latency (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3), and

ii. A context switching system for said multi-thread execution pipeline loop (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3), having:

(1) A context switch requesting subsystem that: detects a device request from a thread executing within said multi-thread execution pipeline loop for access to a device having a fulfillment latency exceeding said pipeline latency (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3), and

(2) Generates a context switch request for said thread (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3), and

iii. A context controller subsystem that receives said context switch request and prevents said thread from executing until said device request is fulfilled (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3).

4. Parady has not taught a tree engine that parses data within said PDUs. Wilford has taught a tree engine that parses data within said PDUs (Wilford column 1, lines 34-42; column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 19; column 14, lines 14-35; and Figure 5B). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as taught in Wilford, would have recognized that a tree engine that parses data within said PDUs identifies which protocol the data belongs to in order to send the data to the correct destination (Wilford column 1, lines 34-42), thereby ensuring correct data execution. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the tree engine of Wilford in the device of Parady to ensure correct data execution.

18. In addition, Parady has not explicitly taught

a. A miss fulfillment first-in-first-out buffer (FIFO); and

b. Based thereon, stores said thread in said miss fulfillment FIFO until said device request is fulfilled.

19. However, Parady has taught using a round robin scheduling method (Parady column 4, lines 9-11). OS-9 has taught round robin scheduling (OS-9 page 5) with a

a. A miss fulfillment first-in-first-out buffer (FIFO) (OS-9 page 5); and

b. Based thereon, store said thread in said miss fulfillment FIFO to prevent said thread from executing until said device request is fulfilled (OS-9 page 5).

20. In regards to OS-9, the event queue stores processes that are blocked, waiting for some event to complete, like an I/O access. This is similar to a miss fulfillment FIFO, which, by its name and the language in the claim, stores processes that wait for some other event, like an I/O access, to complete. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that a round-robin scheduling method is a fairly simple method that guarantees that all processes will be executed while ensuring that priority between processes is maintained, thereby preventing starvation of a process while giving consideration to more important processes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the round robin method of OS-9 in the device to ensure all processes are executed while maintaining priority and simplicity.

21. Referring to claim 16, Parady in view of Wilford and in further view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem further allows a new thread to enter said multi-thread execution pipeline loop after storing said thread in said FIFO (OS-9 page 5). In regards to OS-9, after waiting for the event, e.g. I/O access, to complete, the process is moved to the active queue, which holds processes active and ready to be executed (OS-9 page 5). From the active queue, the highest priority process runs each tick (OS-9 page 5).

22. Referring to claim 17, Parady in view of Wilford and in further view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem further allows other threads within said multi-thread execution pipeline loop to continue to execute while said thread is waiting for said device request

to be fulfilled (Parady column 2, lines 28-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, line 42-62; and Figure 3).

23. Referring to claim 18, Parady in view of Wilford and in further view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem is further configured to:

a. Store said thread in said miss fulfillment FIFO upon reaching an end position of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop (OS-9 page 5),

b. Sequence said thread through said miss fulfillment FIFO (OS-9 page 5), and

c. Reinsert said thread into said multi-thread execution pipeline loop at a beginning position (OS-9 page 5).

24. Referring to claim 19, Parady in view of Wilford and in further view of OS-9 has taught wherein said thread is looped back to a beginning stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop when said thread reaches an end stage of said multi-thread execution pipeline loop and said thread has not finished processing (OS-9 page 5).

25. Referring to claim 20, Parady in view of Wilford and in further view of OS-9 has taught wherein said context controller subsystem further sequences said thread through said miss fulfillment FIFO at a rate having a period substantially equivalent to said pipeline latency (OS-9 page 5). In regards to OS-9, the wait queue only holds processes that are blocked and waiting for some event to complete, e.g. waiting for an I/O access to complete. This I/O access latency substantially equivalent to the pipeline latency.

5. Referring to claim 21, Parady in view of Wilford and in further view of OS-9 has taught wherein said device request is said DRAM and said device request is a request to access said DRAM due to a cache miss status from said memory cache (Parady Abstract; column 1, lines 29-

35 and 46-57; column 2, lines 18-34; column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 18; column 4, lines 42-62; Figure 3).

Response to Arguments

26. The Examiner withdraws the rejection of claims 2, 9, 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112 in favor of the amended claims.

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aimee J. Li whose telephone number is (571) 272-4169. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:00am-4:30pm.

29. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

30. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AJL

Aimee J. Li
30 September 2005

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100